

Multimedia Appendix 3. Full data from the review.

[illegible]

Freeman et al. (2008) [27] England	College students Psychological problems N = 283 $I^1 = 141$ $I^2_{\text{peer support}} = 142$	M = 21 SD = not reported F = 70%	I^1 : Website containing information about common student problems $I^2_{\text{peer support}}$: Website with the addition of an online mutual support group which used an electronic bulletin board	Electronic bulletin board Research Unknown Unknown	RT No	$I^1 = 82$ $I^2_{\text{peer support}} = 51$ $I^1 = 59$ (42%) $I^2_{\text{peer support}} = 91$ (64%)	CORE-OM Baseline Post intervention (10 weeks)	Adding online peer support did not increase the effectiveness of the intervention.	I^1 vs $I^2 = -.22$ CI: -0.57, 0.13
Eating disorders									
Low et al. (2006) [24] USA	Undergraduate women Non-symptomatic N=61 $I^1 = 14$ $I^2_{\text{peer support}} = 19$ $I^3_{\text{peer support}} = 14$ C = 14	M = not reported SD = not reported F = 100%	I^1 : "Student Bodies" (8 weeks web-based computer program with no discussion group) $I^2_{\text{peer support}}$: "Student Bodies" (8 weeks web-based computer program with an unmoderated discussion group) $I^3_{\text{peer support}}$: "Student Bodies" (8 weeks web-based computer program with a clinically moderated discussion group) C: No intervention	Discussion groups Research Unmoderated and moderated Clinical psychologist	RCT Yes, however, only some outcomes were subject to ITT analysis. Results below pertain to the completer analyses.	N = 61 n = 11 (15%)	EDI – Bulimia, Body Dissatisfaction, and Drive for Thinness subscales Baseline Post intervention (8 weeks) Follow-up (11-12 months)	Bulimia: Adding online peer support did not increase the effectiveness of the intervention. Body Dissatisfaction: Adding online peer support did not increase the effectiveness of the intervention. Drive for Thinness: Adding online peer support did not increase the effectiveness of the intervention.	Bulimia: I^1 vs $I^2 = .52$ CI: 0.18, 1.22 I^1 vs $I^3 = .98$ CI: 0.20, 1.77 Body Dissatisfaction: I^1 vs $I^2 = -1.05$ CI: -1.84, -0.26 I^1 vs $I^3 = .07$ CI: -0.67, 0.81 Drive for Thinness: I^1 vs $I^2 = -.48$ CI: -1.18, 0.22 I^1 vs $I^3 = -.59$ CI: -1.34, 0.17
Substance abuse (tobacco)									
Woodruff et al. (2001) [29]	Rural teens Smokers	M = 15 SD = not reported	$I^1_{\text{peer support}}$: Seven 1-hour intervention chat sessions in real-time virtual	Virtual world chat room Research	Pre-post No	N = 18 n = 8 (31%)	Percentage of smoking abstinence in the past week	A non-significant increase in the percentage of smoking abstinence	N/A

USA	N = 26	F = not reported	world with a trained cessation counsellor over a 2-month period	Moderated Trained cessation counsellor			Baseline Post intervention (2 months) Follow-up (1 month)	from pre to post-intervention.	
Woodruff et al. (2007) [25] USA	Adolescent smokers Smokers N = 136 I ¹ peer support = 77 C = 59	M = 16 SD = not reported F = 46%	I ^{peer support} : Seven 45-minute intervention chat sessions in real-time virtual world with a trained cessation counsellor over a 7-week period C: No intervention	Virtual world chat room Research Moderated Trained cessation counsellor	RCT Yes	N = 102 n = 34 (25%)	Past-week smoking abstinence (yes vs. no) Baseline Post-intervention (7 weeks) Follow-up (3 months) Follow-up (12 months)	Online peer support was effective compared to the control condition.*	N/A

Notes: I = intervention group, C = control group, RCT = randomized controlled trial, RT = randomized trial, CBT = cognitive behavioral therapy

Measures: DASS = Depression Anxiety Stress Scale, CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, EDI = The Eating Disorders Inventory, CORE-OM = The Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation – Outcome Measure, K-10 = Kessler Psychological Distress Scale

* Significant difference between the online peer support intervention and the control group at post-intervention